

**REMARKS**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,472,735 to Isaak ("Isaak")<sup>1</sup>. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claim 9. Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application, with claims 9-16 presented for examination.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference ... [t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." MPEP § 2131 8th Ed. (Rev. 4), October, 2005 (internal citations omitted). Because Isaak fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 9-16, Isaak cannot anticipate claims 9-16.

For example, Isaak fails to teach at least "first connection terminals having a first spacing therebetween ... and a first connection portion spaced from the first connection terminals at a second spacing greater than the first spacing," as recited in amended claim 9 (emphasis added). At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has labeled and characterized a portion of Figure 4 of Isaak as allegedly illustrating a "connection portion (26) as not being electrically connected." The Examiner has thus apparently characterized either of these two specific base pads 26 of Isaak as constituting Applicant's claimed "a first connection portion ... not electrically connected to any terminal of the integrated circuit chip," as recited in claim 9. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Isaak, Applicant notes

that Isaak, for example in Figure 4, illustrates base pads 26 arranged on the periphery of base substrate 14, which appear to have the same spacing therebetween. Thus, even if the two specific base pads 26 identified by the Examiner as “not electrically connected to any terminal of the integrated circuit chip,” could be reasonably construed to constitute Applicant’s claimed “first connection portions,” the two specific base pads 26 are not spaced from other base pads 26 “at a second spacing greater than the first spacing,” as recited in amended claim 9. Moreover, Isaak does not provide any disclosure that teaches providing the two specific base pads 26 at a “second spacing greater than [a] first spacing,” as recited in amended claim 9. Isaak thus fails to teach a combination including “first connection terminals having a first spacing therebetween ... and a first connection portion spaced from the first connection terminals at a second spacing greater than the first spacing,” as recited in amended claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Isaak fails to teach each and every element of claim 9. Claim 9 is thus allowable over Isaak and claims 10-16 are allowable at least due to their dependence on claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 7, 2006

By   
Darrell D. Kinder, Jr.  
Reg. No. 57,460